

APPROVED Minutes of the **REGULAR MEETING OF THE ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD** held on Thursday, September 20, 2012, in the Public Meeting Room of the Village Hall, One Olde Half Day Road, Lincolnshire, IL.

PRESENT: Chairman Grover, Members Hardnock, Gulatee, Kennerley, and Alternate Member Schlecht.

ABSENT: Trustee Liaison McDonough.

ALSO PRESENT: Steve McNellis, Director of Community Development and Stephen Robles, Planner.

CALL TO ORDER: **Chairman Pro Tem Grover** called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.

1.0 ROLL CALL

The roll was called by **Planner Robles** and **Chairman Pro Tem Grover** declared a quorum to be present.

2.0 APPROVAL OF MINUTES

2.1 Approval of the Minutes of the Regular Architectural Review Board Meeting held Tuesday, July 17, 2012.

Alternate Member Schlecht moved and **Member Hardnock** seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the regular Meeting of the Architectural Review Board held Tuesday, July 17, 2012. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

3.0 ITEMS OF GENERAL BUSINESS:

3.1 Continued consideration and discussion regarding a variation to Section 12-9-1-B-10, *Wall Signs*, to permit internally illuminated wall signs, rather than the code required backlit/halo illumination, for three wall signs associated with Sysmex America Inc, for the property located at 577 Aptakistic Road (The Holland Design Group).

Planner Robles noted the request was last discussed at the July 17th ARB meeting and continued to allow the Petitioner to submit additional documentation in support of the internal illumination variation request. Even though the provided presentation packet did not contain any new documents from the July meeting, the Petitioner was presenting additional information at the meeting.

Tom Holland, The Holland Design Group, representing Sysmex America, summarized the request was last discussed two months ago and the variation request for an increase in wall sign height received a positive recommendation from the ARB. He continued that due to scheduling conflicts, representatives for Sysmex America were not able to attend the meeting, and the Holland Design Group was authorized to represent Sysmex and the variation request. The compromise proposed by Staff to internally illuminate the Sysmex bowtie logo and illuminate the Sysmex copy in code-compliant halo lighting was discussed with the Sysmex corporation and such was not to the company standards and the entire wall signage needed to be internally illuminated. Sysmex provided copies of their entire global

corporate branding requirements booklet for the ARB's review. **Mr. Holland** presented the themes of the Sysmex logo and the color representations of their branding. A video was created to show the building during the morning, afternoon and evening hours to show the relationship of the sign to the building, and the signs to the area.

Art Holland, The Holland Design Group, provided commentary of the video during playback.

Member Kennerly clarified from the two sign images from the video, the image displayed on the right side was the same being requested to include internal illumination. **Art Holland** confirmed the right sign (depicting internal illumination) was being requested. **Member Kennerly** commented that in her opinion the halo-illuminated wall sign image was more legible to her. **Member Gulatee** expressed that he was having problems clearly seeing either sign from the video and the blue from sign was also difficult to see.

Member Gulatee questioned what the intent was with the sign, what was it trying to say? **Art Holland** explained Sysmex is trying to display a logo mark that is consistent with their corporate identity. **Member Kennerly** added as she understood it, Sysmex was not interested in the advertising portion of their sign, but the sign would be more for internal identification for employees. **Member Hardnock** noted there is also one monument sign on the property that is internally illuminated that was not being shown on the video. **Member Gulatee** sought clarification on the presentation that Sysmex's sign was trying to convey the message of identification without identifying themselves outside of the corporation. **Art Holland** responded that the signs were a result from not selling anything or advertising anything, but for identification for the corporate employees and executives that go to that location. The identification is meant for internal reasons.

Chairman Pro Tem Grover noted the two inset images comparing the two different types of illumination for the wall signs, and stated his original thought was the bowtie was intended to be displayed in the Sysmex color scheme only, but it appeared that Sysmex also intended for the letters to be internally illuminated so that the colors all match. **Art Holland** confirmed the entire sign is the logo, including the letters and color scheme.

Member Kennerly sought clarification on the illumination of the working sample sign presented to the ARB and if it was true to how it would appear on the building or if it were going to be brighter. **Art Holland** confirmed the sample was a true representation and would not be any brighter.

Chairman Pro Tem Grover questioned if the Sysmex corporate position was for all internal illumination or all halo-lit signage, and not a combination. **Art Holland** confirmed it was their direction from Sysmex that it had to be all the same type of illumination, not a combination, specifically for internal illumination.

Member Schlecht sought confirmation from Staff regarding the previous variation request for an increase in wall sign height and if an increase in the number of wall signs was also required. **Planner Robles** confirmed the ARB had already recommended approval for an increase in wall sign height and the number of signs proposed was compliant with Code. **Member Schlecht** pointed out a variety of Sysmex logo options from the provided corporate identification standards booklet, which varied from the proposed sign design. He continued noting the ARB was aware that all corporations have their own logos and the Village has an ordinance, and the ARB was trying to grasp why to create a variance when he personally did not see a reason why Sysmex was different from a Walgreens. Walgreens has complied (with sign illumination), and they too are an international company. **Art Holland** responded that Sysmex is a corporation and the property is owned by the corporation and the signage is specific to the property. There is no other building identical to Sysmex on Aptaksic Road, with the square footage, with (signage affixed) 50 feet in height, with four floors that is all dedicated to corporate space. Sysmex is not retailing like Walgreens or any other retail business. **Member Schlecht** questioned if the Sign Code differentiates a retailer from a business. **Planner Robles** responded the Sign Code does not differentiate amongst the two. **Member Schlecht** commented to the ARB if they approve a variance without anything to stand on, someone else would be able to come forward and point to the fact that Sysmex received a variation. He continued, he was trying to figure out why there is an ordinance if the ARB is just going to give out variations left and right. **Chairman Pro Tem Grover** responded such was the challenge for the ARB, especially when Sysmex was combining the bowtie logo with the letters as their whole corporate logo, and why that would be different from any other company. He continued he was also challenged with this request since the standards required the variance to be unique to the property and not generally to other properties within the same zoning classification, and how is Sysmex different from that perspective? **Art Holland** responded Sysmex is unique based on their corporate location in a dedicated building, specific to their corporate executives and not for any retail sales. The building is 50 feet in height and the sign is in muted colors, the sign is not oversized, they are just asking for one variation for the internal illumination. **Member Hardnock** commented the issue is the precedent that would be set in the Village. As soon as the ARB decides to extend a variance beyond the Code, then everybody would also want the same relief. The discussion at the last meeting was the justification for the variance request; this was what the ARB was having trouble with. **Member Hardnock** continued by pointing out the Sysmex logo and colors would be visible during the day, to meet the corporate standards, it was the corporate identity at night that was the reason for this discussion. Further discussion ensued regarding the variation proposal and the variation standards for the ARB's consideration.

There being no further comment, **Chairman Pro Tem Grover** requested a motion for ARB consideration.

Mr. Hardnock moved and Mr. Schlecht seconded a motion to approve a variation to Section 12-9-1-B, Wall Signs, to permit internally illuminated wall signs, rather than the code required backlit/halo illumination, for three wall signs associated

with Sysmex America Inc for the property commonly addressed as 577 Aptakistic Road.

A roll call vote was taken as follows:

Ayes – Kennerly

Nayes – Chairman Pro Tem Grover, Hardnock, Gulatee, and Alternate Schlecht

The motion failed to receive sufficient positive votes for an approval recommendation.

- 3.2 Consideration and discussion of modifications to the approved site plan, landscape plan, building elevations, materials and colors, and signage for the McDonald's restaurant located at 450 Milwaukee Avenue (Franchise Realty Investment Trust - IL).

Planner Robles summarized Staff's memorandum and noted McDonald's proposal included a series of modifications to their site along with new site identification. The proposal would redevelop the current single drive-thru lane to a double drive-thru operation, which would primarily affect the central "island" of the site consisting of the building, drive-thru lane and limited parking. He continued, from the result of the new drive-thru configuration, a larger green space between the building and drive-thru lanes would be created and proposed to be landscaped with a variety of native plantings, evergreen shrubs, groundcover, and trees. The island include a 2-3' tall berm in order to elevate the landscaping and better screen the rear of the building and the cars in the drive-thru. While there were a significant number of plant types and quantities in the island, the amount of sod that remained seemed too much and he recommended the amount be reduced, if not removed entirely and replaced with additional native plantings.

Planner Robles continued by noting exterior building modifications were also included in the proposal. The main façade material would be replaced with hardiboard cement siding in a new two-toned color scheme. The "main" building color would change to "Monterey Taupe", which was a more natural tan or light brown color and select building features would be treated in a darker brown color called "Timber Bark". The existing grayish-brown brick base would remain in place. In addition, the existing cedar shake roof was also proposed to be replaced with metal roof shingles colored in "Sierra Slate Grey". Use of metal roofing material of such scope would be unique, especially in the area, and would be the first to cover an entire building in the Village. Since Staff was unfamiliar with the material, there was uncertainty if it was too great of a departure from the traditional design of the site and within the area, and if more traditional roofing materials should be used instead. **Planner Robles** further noted during the referral of the request, two Village Trustees commented that the design of the front building elevation appeared too minimal and suggested further modifications be provided and noted the McDonald's architect was available to present the building elevations and provide additional information regarding the Board's request.

Planner Robles continued his presentation explaining an entirely new sign package was also proposed for the site. New replacement monument signs and wall signage were all designed to the requirements of the new Sign Code, including illumination

and landscaping. The addition of a second drive-thru also resulted in the need for a second menu board sign. The Sign Code permits only one menu board sign no larger than 40 square feet in sign area. However, two menu boards at 43 square feet each were being proposed. While the overall number of menu boards would exceed code, it was necessary with the double-thru facility. Further, he noted the increase in sign area was minimal and given the signs would be located in the interior of the site; they would not be visible from either street frontage. New drive-thru canopies would also replace the existing informational signs with McDonald's new "eyebrow" design. While Staff understood the design, material and color were a corporate standard, it resulted in inconsistent signage on the site which is against Code. Another standardized sign was the "Welcome" directional sign at the Milwaukee Avenue entrance. In an effort to provide sign consistency, the base had been designed to match the brick base of the monument signs. Staff believed such base material could appear rather excessive for this directional sign, but he noted it did provide consistency. Overall, Staff was supportive of McDonald's proposed site modifications, but continued to have uncertainty regarding the metal roof shingles and their use over more traditional roofing materials. In addition, since the new sign package contained a mixture of custom signs consistent with the building and corporate standardized signage, Staff was willing to support the standard corporate signs if at least one of the code elements of design, color or material was used. **Planner Robles** concluded that Staff had provided recommended conditions in the memo for the ARB's consideration of the request to address the stated Staff concerns.

Mariah DiGrino, DLA Piper, representing McDonald's summarized the proposed modifications and designs from the presentation packet, which was all part of a corporate model in updating multiple restaurants. The Lincolnshire McDonald's was not the only restaurant being updated. However, with respect to the Village McDonald's, the design has been changed dramatically from what was initially proposed to ensure it continues to fit within the surrounding area. The restaurant was also seeking to update the exterior building without changing the look, to use more maintenance free materials. The proposed materials were selected to replicate the existing materials that are currently seen at the site, with less maintenance required. **Ms. DiGrino** also summarized the sign revisions that were included in the proposal and noted all the new ground signs, wall signs and the "welcome" entry sign have been designed to comply with Code. However, the directional signs as noted by Staff are intended as directional signs to assist customers as they move through the site. Such signs are internal to the site and not intended to be viewed from the public way or other adjoining properties. The directional signs were not only essential to the corporate policy of McDonald's, but also the signs were uniform throughout each restaurant so customers would not be confused as they visited different McDonald's restaurants.

Fred T. Matthias, Lingle Design Group, architect for McDonald's presented the proposed building modifications and distributed a materials sample board to the ARB. He continued by presenting the site modifications for the double drive-thru configuration and explained that all signage would be new and comply with the Sign Code. **Member Schlecht** sought clarification if any landscape changes and improvements were being proposed. **Mr. Mathias** pointed out the reconfiguration

of the drive-thru lane provided a larger island for landscaping between the building and drive-thru lanes. He continued to describe the revisions for the drive-thru lanes including the reconfiguration of the pay window and food pick-up window to allow additional stacking in between each. **Member Schlecht** asked if there were any dedicated overflow area in case the order was not ready. **Mr. Mathias** explained there was not, and the new configuration should eliminate the need for any overflow areas. He then presented the as-built landscape plan and the proposed landscape plan and described the planting additions and improvements being proposed. **Member Schlecht** questioned if any additional landscaping was added to the rear of the property. **Mr. Mathias** noted there would be the addition of some trees. **Planner Robles** clarified new trees would be planted to replace the existing Ash trees that were removed a couple of years ago. **Member Schlecht** sought confirmation a landscape screen would be provided between the school and the restaurant. **Director McNellis** confirmed such and noted there was also an existing fence in place. **Member Kennerley** questioned if the new landscaping would consist of evergreen plantings that would be green all year long. **Mr. Mathias** confirmed evergreens plants were part of the plan, in addition to other plant materials. He further explained the reasoning for the grass strip within the large landscaped island referenced in the Staff memorandum, which was to catch mulch. They had done without the grass band at other McDonald's and noted the mulch just washed onto the pavement and became a maintenance issue, which was why the band of sod was provided.

Mr. Mathias presented two design options for the "welcome" directional sign per Staff's comments. Option 2 was designed to be more consistent with the architecture of the building and he believed was more in-line with Staff's review comments for the sign. **Planner Robles** asked if there was a close-up detail of the Option 2 directional sign in **Mr. Mathias'** presentation since the presentation packet did not contain any such image. **Mr. Mathias** confirmed such and provided an enlarged image of both directional sign designs. **Member Schlecht** questioned if the "clearance height" sign was tall enough for vehicle clearance at 8'-6". **Mr. Mathias** confirmed the height was sufficient for most vehicles and the first clearance height post would inform customers if their vehicle was too tall. **Director McNellis** questioned if the clearance bar height was the same height as the building canopy of the drive-thru windows, to which **Mr. Mathias** confirmed.

Mr. Mathias continued his presentation and noted the last time he was presenting the proposal to the Village Board, he did not do a good job showing the front elevation. One of the reasons the front elevation was not revised since that meeting was the current elevation provided an appropriate location for wall signage and whatever changes he explored resulted in hiding the signage. He then passed around a different angle view of the front elevation that illustrated the various building relief. **Mr. Mathias** proceeded presenting the other building elevation material and color changes.

Mr. Mathias presented the replacement roof material sample of a galvanized steel roof shingle, which he selected to try and simulate the existing cedar shakes. He noted that once the material is installed on the roof, it gives the appearance of individual shingles and provided photo samples of the installed product. **Mr.**

Mathias also presented an asphalt shake sample as an alternative option since there were doubts expressed by Staff regarding the metal roof material. **Member Hardnock** commented the metal roof appeared cool with the warm building colors proposed. **Member Schlecht** agreed and also noted the warmth provided by the existing cedar shake, which was neither good nor bad, just a difference. Additional discussion ensued on the metal roof material and if it were intended to replicate the existing weathered cedar shakes. **Mr. Mathias** clarified the intention was to remove the existing cedar shakes and replace them with a nice substitute that went with the architecture. He noted the metal shingles would not have the same color variation as the cedar shakes, but would be more uniform coloring.

Chairman Pro Tem Grover moved discussion to the recommended items outlined in Staff's memorandum to determine if both Staff and the petitioner's were satisfied with each. Additional discussion ensued in regards to each item and if each were sufficiently addressed.

There being no further public comment, **Chairman Pro Tem Grover** requested a motion for ARB consideration.

Mr. Schlecht moved and Mr. Hardnock seconded a motion to approve modifications to the approved site plan, landscape plan, building elevations, materials and colors, and revisions to the approved sign package for the McDonald's restaurant located at 450 Milwaukee Avenue, as presented in a presentation packet submitted by Watermark Engineering and Lingle Design Group, date stamp received August 16, 2012, and further subject to:

- 1. Staff review of the sample metal roofing shingles in daylight hours to ensure a non-reflective finished surface that would prevent sun glare.*
- 2. Prior to Village Board consideration, the following shall be revised for Staff review and acceptance:*
 - a. A site grading plan shall be submitted showing the extent of berming within the drive-thru island.*
 - b. The sod within the landscaped island of the drive-thru area shall be reduced to a maximum width of three feet, with the inclusion of additional evergreen plantings.*
 - c. The Directional Sign shall be redesigned so that the box sign and support pole are "wrapped" in decorative Hardiboard trim and painted in the similar color as the Hardiboard trim detail of the monument ground signs, as shown in Option 2 Alternate in the PowerPoint presentation at the September 20th meeting.*
 - d. An improved representation of the white material color for the Pole Canopy, Welcome Point Gateway and Bollard signs shall be provided, and such color shall not be a glossy finish.*

The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

4.0 UNFINISHED BUSINESS (None)

5.0 NEW BUSINESS

Planner Robles informed the ARB of **Member Sharon Wang's** announcement of her retirement from the ARB effective at the previous July meeting. Staff will be preparing a thank you gift and inviting **Mrs. Wang** to a future meeting to honor her service on the ARB.

6.0 CITIZENS COMMENTS (None)

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, **Chairman Pro Tem Grover** adjourned the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Stephen Robles, Planner.